

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application : **09/868,375**
Applicant(s) : **ANDREWS et al.**
Filed : **6/18/2001**
Confirmation : **8890**
T.C./Art Unit : **2174**
Examiner : **VU, Thanh T.**
Atty. Docket : **PHN-17707**

Title: **INFORMATION PROCESSING DEVICE**

Mail Stop: **APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL UNDER 37 CFR 41.37

Sir:

This is an appeal from the decision of the Examiner dated 7 December 2007, finally rejecting claims 42-44, 47-52, 60-61, 65-68, and 71-74 of the subject application.

This paper includes (each beginning on a separate sheet):

- 1. Appeal Brief;**
- 2. Claims Appendix;**
- 3. Evidence Appendix; and**
- 4. Related Proceedings Appendix.**

APPEAL BRIEF

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The above-identified application is assigned, in its entirety, to **Koninklijke Philips Electronics N. V.**

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have any bearing on, the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-34 and 70 are canceled.

Claims 35-69 and 71-74 are pending in the application.

Claims 35-41, 45-46, and 62-64 are allowed.

Claims 53, 59, and 60 are objected to.

Claims 42-44, 47-52, 60-61, 65-68, and 71-74 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 66-68 and 72 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

These rejected claims are the subject of this appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to the final rejection in the Office Action dated 7 December 2007. A reply to the final rejection was filed on 12 February 2008.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention provides a user interface that includes a display (Applicants' FIG. 1) with a user-controllable flow zone (102), within which flowing links (103) are displayed. Such a display may be mounted in a café table (FIG. 1), on a wall (FIG. 3), and so on, the flowing links attracting a potential user's attention (page 2, lines 2-7; page 5, lines 26-28). In a preferred embodiment, the speed and direction of the flowing links are controllable by the user via what is believed to be a very intuitive interface: the user provides input events in the flow zone, such as 'stroking' items in the flow zone to increase or decrease the speed of flow, akin to spinning a wheel (page 2, lines 24-28).

Independent claim 42 recites an information processing device (200) for exploring information by a user, comprising:

a display screen (101, 205) to display a plurality of flowing links (103) within a flow zone (102) (page 1, lines 22-26), each of the flowing links (103) being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation (108) in a presentation zone (106) of the display screen (page 3, lines 16-20); and

a controller (203) that is configured to selectively change flow speed and flow direction based on locations of user input events within the flow zone (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7).

Independent claim 60 recites a method of accessing internet information content, comprising:

displaying a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone on a display screen of an information processing device (page 1, lines 22-26), each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (page 3, lines 16-20);

selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links based on one or more user input events within the flow zone (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7); and

displaying a linked information unit based on a user selection of one of the plurality of flowing links (page 3, lines 16-20).

Independent claim 61 recites a computer program product embodied in a computer-readable medium (page 5, lines 28-30), comprising:

computer readable program code for displaying a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone on a display screen of an information processing device (page 1, lines 22-26), each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (page 3, lines 16-20);

computer readable program code for responding to an input device of the information processing device for selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links based on a manipulation of the input device that produce user input events within the flow zone (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7); and

computer readable program code for responding to the input device to select one of the flowing links to display a linked information unit (page 3, lines 16-20).

Independent claim 65 recites a table comprising:

a table top (100) (page 6, line 14);

a graphical user interface occupying a portion of said table top, said graphical user interface comprising a touch screen (101) for interaction by a user and a plurality of user responsive display elements (102, 106) for displaying on the screen (page 6, lines 19-21), the user responsive display elements comprising:

a flow zone (102) comprising a list of flowing links (103) displayed along a periphery of the screen (FIG. 1) (page 6, lines 22-24); and

a presentation zone (106) for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation (108) (page 7, lines 8-10); and

a controller (203) that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone (102) for altering a flow rate of the flowing links (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7).

Dependent claim 66 recites (FIG. 1) a table according to claim 65, wherein said touch screen (101) directly abuts a part of said table top (100) (page 6, lines 14-19).

Dependent claim 67 recites (FIG. 1) a table according to claim 65, wherein said touch screen (101) extends to an outer part of said table top (100) (page 6, lines 14-19).

Independent claim 71 recites a table comprising:

an upper table side (100) having a built-in information processing device (200) and touch screen (101), the touch screen displaying a plurality of user responsive display elements (102, 108), the user responsive display elements comprising:

a flow zone (102) comprising a list of flowing links (103) displayed around a periphery of the screen (FIG. 1) (page 6, lines 22-24); and

a presentation zone (106) for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation (108) (page 7, lines 8-10); and

a controller (203) that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone (102) for altering a flow rate of the flowing links (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7).

Dependent claim 72 recites a table according to claim 71, wherein said touch screen (101) is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side (100) (page 6, lines 14-19).

Independent claim 73 recites a table comprising:

an upper and substantially horizontal table side (100); and

an information processing device (200), comprising:

a display screen (101) disposed substantially horizontally in said upper table side (100) to display a plurality of flowing links (103) within a flow zone (102), each of the flowing links (103) being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation (108) in a presentation zone (106) of the display screen (101) (page 7, lines 8-10); and

an input device (204) responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links (page 9, lines 12-15); and

a controller (203) that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone (102) for altering a flow rate of the flowing links (page 2, lines 15-34; page 7, lines 6-7).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 42-44, 47, 49-50, and 60-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz et al. (USP 5,959,621, hereinafter Nawaz) and Yamada et al. (USP 6,259,432, hereinafter Yamada).

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, and Barraus et al. (USP 6,693,652, hereinafter Barraus).

Claims 51 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, and Bates et al. (USP 6,693,652, hereinafter Bates).

Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, Bates, and Glaser (USP 6,392,671).

Claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, and Flutka et al. (USP 5,758,934, hereinafter Flutka).

Claim 56 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, and Naidoo (USP 6,629,136).

Claims 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, and Ku et al. (USP 6,005,767, hereinafter Ku);

Claims 65, 67-68, and 71-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin (USP 6,553,919);

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, Nevin, and McNelly et al. (USP 6,243,130, hereinafter McNelly);

Claim 73 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada¹, and Nevin; and

Claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz, Yamada², Nevin, and Ku.

Claims 66-68 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

VII. ARGUMENT

Claims 42-44, 47, 49-50, and 60-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz and Yamada

MPEP 2142 states:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*... If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness."

Claims 42-44, 47, 49-50, and 60-61

The combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of flow elements in a flow zone based on the locations of user input events within the flow zone, as specifically claimed in independent claim 42, upon which claims 43-58 depend. Independent claims 60 and 61 include a similar limitation.

The Office action acknowledges that Nawaz fails to teach selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of flow elements in a flow zone based on the locations of user input events within the flow zone, and relies on Yamada for this teaching.

¹ The Office action does not reference Yamada in the statement of rejection; however, Yamada is referenced in the accompanying text to this rejection. The applicants assume that the omission was a typographical error.

² See footnote 1.

The Office action asserts that Yamada provides this teaching at FIGs. 6-7 and column 18, lines 20-47. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. At the cited text, Yamada describes the display of speed indicators on the display screen, but does not teach or suggest that the speed of scrolling is **based on user input events within the flow zone**, as specifically taught and claimed by the applicants. The applicants respectfully note that Yamada specifically teaches the use of a scrolling button on a mouse device to control the speed of scrolling **independent of the location** of the mouse cursor at the time that the user activates the scroll button.

Yamada specifically teaches that when the scrolling button is pressed, the conventional location-determining function of the mouse is deactivated:

"As the normal mouse cursor operation is not directly related to the subject of the present invention, no further explanation for it will be given. When the middle button is clicked, i.e., when b2=1, the mouse driver assumes that **the displacement (dx, dy) of the ball is not related to the moving of the mouse cursor but to the scrolling in an active window.**" (Yamada, column 14, lines 53-59, emphasis added.)

That is, as specifically taught by Yamada, whenever the user clicks the scroll button, the active window will be scrolled, regardless of the location of the mouse cursor. Yamada's FIG. 5 illustrates scrolling control based on a movement of the mouse when the middle button on the mouse is clicked.

As taught and claimed by the applicants, the interpretation of a user's actions within the flow zone as being flow control actions provides for a very intuitive interface for controlling the flow in the flow zone. An interface that accepts flow control actions independent of where these actions occur introduces a level of abstraction that is significantly less intuitive than the interface provided in the applicants' claimed invention. "Grabbing" or "stroking" a moving item within the flow zone and causing it to correspondingly change speed and/or direction, for example, is significantly more natural/intuitive than selecting a particular button to press. By associating user input events within the flow zone to flow control events, a casual/inexperienced user will quickly discover how to control the flowing elements on the display screen. Conversely, learning to perform particular actions, such as

clicking a particular button, without any apparent association to the flow zone, will generally be a 'hit and miss' affair, for which a casual user will quickly lose interest.

In the Advisory Action of 11 March 2008, the Examiner references steps S30 and S40 in FIG. 4 for teaching control of the flow based on the location of user input events within the flow zone. The applicants respectfully note that the flow diagram of FIG. 4 lacks any reference to the location of the mouse cursor when the user input event occurs. Scrolling actions are taken based solely on whether the message from the operating system (OS) is a scrolling message (ScrollMsg). As taught by Yamada:

"ScrollMsg is issued when the mouse driver detects the clicking of the middle button of the mouse 200 (i.e, b2=1)." (Yamada, column 17, lines 44-46.)

As specifically taught by Yamada, scrolling is solely dependent upon whether the middle button on the mouse is clicked. If the middle button is not clicked, scrolling will not occur, regardless of the location of the mouse cursor; if the middle button is clicked, scrolling will occur, again regardless of the location of the mouse cursor.

Because Yamada does not teach or suggest controlling a flow of flow elements within a flow zone based on the location of input events within the flow zone, and because Yamada specifically teaches controlling a flow based on input events independent of the location of these events, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 42-44, 47, 49-50, and 60-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nawaz and Yamada is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Barraus**

Claim 48

Claim 48 is dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claims 51 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Bates**

Claims 51 and 54

Claims 51 and 54 is dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claims 51 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, Bates, and Glaser**

Claim 52

Claim 52 is dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Flutka**

Claim 55

Claim 55 is dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claim 56 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Naidoo**

Claim 56

Claim 56 is dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claims 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Ku**

Claims 57-58

Claims 57-58 are dependent upon claim 42. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz and Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 42, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claims 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz and Yamada for teaching the elements of claim 42 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

**Claims 65, 67-68, and 71-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin**

Claims 65, 67-68, and 71-72

The combination of Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin fails to teach or suggest a controller that is responsive to user input events within a flow zone for altering a flow rate of flowing links, as specifically claimed in claim 65, upon which claims 67-68 depend, and as claimed in claim 71, upon which claim 72 depends.

In this rejection, the Examiner relies on Yamada for teaching a controller that is responsive to user input events within a flow zone for altering a flow rate of flowing links. As detailed above, Yamada does not provide this teaching, and specifically teaches a contrary method of control that is independent of whether input events occur within the flow zone. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claims 65, 67-68, and 71-72 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Yamada for providing this teaching is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, Nevin, and McNelly

Claim 66

Claim 66 is dependent upon claim 65. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin for teaching the elements of claim 65. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 65, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 66 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz, Yamada, Ku, and Nevin for teaching the elements of claim 65 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claim 73 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, and Nevin

Claim 73

The combination of Nawaz, Yamada, and Nevin fails to teach or suggest a controller that is responsive to user input events within a flow zone for altering a flow rate of flowing links, as specifically claimed in claim 73.

In this rejection, the Examiner relies on Yamada for teaching a controller that is responsive to user input events within a flow zone for altering a flow rate of flowing links. As detailed above, Yamada does not provide this teaching, and specifically teaches a contrary method of control that is independent of whether input events occur within the flow zone. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Yamada for providing this teaching is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Nawaz, Yamada, Nevin, and Ku

Claim 74

Claim 74 is dependent upon claim 73. In this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Nawaz, Yamada, and Nevin for teaching the elements of claim 73. As noted above, the combination of Nawaz, Yamada, and Nevin fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 73, and Yamada specifically teaches a contrary method of flow control. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that a rejection of claim 74 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Nawaz, Yamada, and Nevin for teaching the elements of claim 73 is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 66-68 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph
Claims 66-68

The Office action asserts that claims 66-68 and 72 include subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The specification states:

"Figure 1 shows a part 100 of the upper side of a table, for example a coffee corner table, having a built in information processing device and touch screen 101 according to the invention. The table has a round or oval shape and the touch screen occupies half of the table top 100. The borders of the touch screen 101 follow the edge of table top 100."

Claim 65 recites that the touch screen directly abuts a part of the table top. FIG. 1 clearly illustrates touch screen 101 abutting the region of table top 100 at the periphery of the touch screen 101.

Claim 66 recites that the touch screen extends to an outer part of the table top. FIG. 1 clearly illustrates that touch screen 101 extends to the outer part of the table top 100; the outer part being the area between the screen 101 and the edge of the table top 100.

Claims 67 and 68 recite that the touch screen is enclosed in the table top by the outer part. FIG. 1 clearly illustrates that the outer part of the table top 100 encloses the touch screen 101.

Claim 72 recites that the touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of the upper table side. The specification recites that the example touch screen is located in a table top, and table tops are conventionally horizontal. FIG. 1 clearly illustrates that touch screen 101 extends to the outer part of the table top 100; the outer part being the area between the screen 101 and the edge of the table top 100.

Because the specification recites that FIG. 1 illustrates an example embodiment, and FIG. 1, as originally filed, clearly illustrates each of the elements of claims 66-68 and 72 in sufficient detail to convey to one of skill in the art that the applicants had possession of the claimed invention at the time that the application was filed, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 66-68 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is unfounded and should be reversed by the Board.

CONCLUSIONS

Because none of the proposed combinations teach or suggest controlling the flow of flow elements in a flow zone based on user input events in the flow zone, and because Yamada specifically teaches controlling flow independent of the location of the user events, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 42-44, 47-52, 60-61, 65-68, and 71-74 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board, and the claims be allowed to pass to issue.

Because the specification and its reference to FIG. 1 clearly demonstrates that the applicants had possession of the claimed invention at the time that the application was filed, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 66-68 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph be reversed by the Board, and the claims be allowed to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Registration Number 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Esq.
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
914-333-9618

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-34 (canceled)

35-41 (allowed)

42. An information processing device for exploring information by a user, comprising:
a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen; and
a controller that is configured to selectively change flow speed and flow direction based on locations of user input events within the flow zone.

43. An information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the flowing links move at a default non-zero flow speed and a default flow direction within the flow zone, and the user input events selectably change the flow speed or flow direction.

44. An information processing device according to claim 43, including a user operable point-and-select device for providing the input events including selecting a location within the flow zone,
wherein flow of the flowing links within the flow zone is stoppable in response to the user statically selecting a location within the flow zone with the user operable point-and-select device.

45-46 (allowed)

47. An information processing device according to claim 43, wherein the flow zone is arranged to display the links and flow control areas, and the flow is controlled by selecting the flow control areas with the input device.

48. An information processing device according to claim 42, wherein a presentation of the content from the related information unit is initiated by a user input event that includes dragging a selected link to the presentation zone.

49. An information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising:
a filtering unit including a plurality of user selectable filters for controlling the flow zone to display links to information units which meet a requirement imposed by a selected filter.

50. An information processing device according to claim 49, wherein the filtering unit adapts the selected filter to display links to information units similar to the related information unit.

51. An information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising:
a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone.

52. An information processing device according to claim 51, further comprising:
a detector for communicating with a user supplied data carrier in response to control by the user-link unit for sorting and/or retrieving the user-links.

53 (objected to)

54. An information processing device according to claim 51, wherein a frequency of display of an information unit in the flow zone is determined by an age and/or popularity of the information unit.

55. An information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising:
a table for supporting the display screen.

56. An information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device.

57. An information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the display screen and the controller are embodied as part of a portable device.

58. An information processing device according to claim 57, wherein the portable device is a hand-held device.

59 (objected to)

60. A method of accessing internet information content, comprising:

displaying a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone on a display screen of an information processing device, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen;

selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links based on one or more user input events within the flow zone;

displaying a linked information unit based on a user selection of one of the plurality of flowing links.

61. A computer program product embodied in a computer-readable medium, comprising:

- computer readable program code for displaying a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone on a display screen of an information processing device, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen;

- computer readable program code for responding to an input device of the information processing device for selectively changing flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links based on a manipulation of the input device that produce user input events within the flow zone; and

- computer readable program code for responding to the input device to select one of the flowing links to display a linked information unit.

62-64 (allowed)

65. A table comprising:

- a table top;

- a graphical user interface occupying a portion of said table top, said graphical user interface comprising a touch screen for interaction by a user and a plurality of user responsive display elements for displaying on the screen, the user responsive display elements comprising:

- a flow zone comprising a list of flowing links displayed along a periphery of the screen; and

- a presentation zone for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation; and

- a controller that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering a flow rate of the flowing links.

66. A table according to claim 65, wherein said touch screen directly abuts a part of said table top.

67. A table according to claim 65, wherein said touch screen extends to an outer part of said table top.

68. A table according to claim 67, wherein said touch screen is enclosed in said table top by said outer part.

69 (objected to)

70 (canceled)

71. A table comprising:

- an upper table side having a built-in information processing device and touch screen, the touch screen displaying a plurality of user responsive display elements, the user responsive display elements comprising:

- a flow zone comprising a list of flowing links displayed around a periphery of the screen; and

- a presentation zone for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation; and

- a controller that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering a flow rate of the flowing links.

72. A table according to claim 71, wherein said touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side.

73. A table comprising:

an upper and substantially horizontal table side; and

an information processing device, comprising:

a display screen disposed substantially horizontally in said upper table side to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen; and

an input device responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links; and

a controller that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering a flow rate of the flowing links.

74. The table according to claim 73, wherein:

the display screen and the input device cooperate to form a graphical user interface,

the display screen is a touch screen adapted for interaction with a user, and

the plurality of flowing links within the flow zone are user responsive display elements displayed around a periphery of the screen.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted that is relied upon by the appellant in this appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have any bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.